



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,806	08/07/2000	Sameh W. Asaad	YOR9-2000-0175	3370

21254 7590 12/31/2002

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

DINH, DUC Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,806

Applicant(s)

ASAAD ET AL.

Examiner

DUC Q DINH

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “radio frequency (RF) link or an infrared (IR) link” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strongin. (6,304,935).

In reference to claims 1 and 9, Strongin discloses a method and system for data transmission in data processing systems, especially in the context of data processing systems utilizing the Accelerated Graphics Port (AGP) interface standard. As shown in FIG. 1 a high-

Art Unit: 2674

level component diagram depicting an AGP-enabled data processing system 101 which forms an environment wherein one or more embodiments of the present invention may be practiced. In addition, FIG. 1 will be utilized to show, in broad overview, how the use of texturing to create 3D continuous-animation produces data bottlenecking in non-AGP systems, and how AGP-enabled systems alleviate such data bottlenecking as well as give extended capabilities. Shown are three building blocks of AGP: AGP-enabled graphics controller 100, AGP interconnect 102 (a data bus), and AGP-enabled Northbridge 104. Not shown, but deemed present is a fourth building block of AGP: an AGP-enabled operating system. The term AGP-enabled is intended to mean that the so-referenced components are engineered such that they interface and function under the standards defined within the AGP interface specification, referenced above. Further depicted are display device 110 which is a display unit, local frame buffer 112, Central Processing Unit (CPU) 114, system memory 116, Peripheral Component Interconnect (PCI) bus 118, various Input-Output, (I/O) devices 120, Southbridge 122, Industry Standard Architecture (ISA) bus 123, and I/O devices 125. Strongin fails to disclose graphic adaptor is localized to the monitor. However, absent a showing of critically and/or unexpected result, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to relocate the graphic adapter to the monitor side instead of the PC housing side as desired as was judicially recognized with *IN RE JAPIKEE* USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter.

In reference to claims 2 and 10-11, Strongin discloses link between graphic processor 202 and display device 110 in Fig. 2.

Art Unit: 2674

In reference to claim 3, Strongin disclose CPU 14 and bridge 104 in Fig. 2.

In reference to claims 4-5, Strongin disclose link 102 between circuit 100 and 104 in Fig. 2.

In reference to claims 6-7 and 12, Strongin discloses that the computer system may include a peripheral bus for connecting certain highly integrated peripheral components to the CPU. One such peripheral bus is known as the Peripheral Component Interconnect (PCI) bus. Under the PCI bus standard, peripheral components can directly connect to a PCI bus without the need for glue logic. Thus, PCI is designed to provide a bus standard on which high-performance peripheral devices, such as graphics devices and hard disk drives, can be coupled to the CPU, thereby permitting these high-performance peripheral devices to avoid the general access latency and the band-width constraints that would have occurred if these peripheral devices were connected to a low speed peripheral bus. Details on the PCI local bus standard can be obtained under the PCI Bus Specification, Revision 2.1, from the PCI Special Interest Group, which is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety (col. 1, lines 46-60).

In reference to claims 8 and 13, Strongin discloses in FIG. 3 the control signals 206-212 normally transmitted between AGP-enabled graphics controller 100 and AGP-enabled Northbridge 104, as illustrated in FIG. 2, are not transmitted between AGP-enabled graphics controller 100 and AGP-enabled Northbridge 104. This is because in this embodiment AGP-enabled graphics controller 100 and AGP-enabled Northbridge 104 have been modified such that graphics controller command queue 200 is no longer polled as to whether it can accept data; rather, as discussed below, data flow into graphics controller command queue 200 is controlled

Art Unit: 2674

by use of a buffer management signal which indicates whether or not graphics controller command queue mimicking unit 300 should transmit data.

In reference to claim 22, Strongin fails to disclose that the first portion and second portion of the bus is housed in different enclosure. However,

Absent a showing of critically and/or unexpected result, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to “separate the bus bridge in two portion” (and put into different housing) as desired as was judicially recognized with *NERWIN V. ERLICHMAN*, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO BD. OF INT. 1969) which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter.

Claims 14-21 and 23 are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-13 and therefore, rejected based on the same basis set forth in said claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on October 17th, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “... the solution to such a problem is use of an extended bus bridge whose primary and secondary interfaces reside in two different chassis or enclosures connected by a set of wires whose length is range of a few meters to accommodate the distance between the PC or workstation box and the monitor or display unit. This must differ from Strongin; the present invention in address the bottleneck of writing the data from the graphic frame buffer to the remote display through the display cable; the elimination of a bottleneck in the system caused by having to carry all of the bandwidth of the high resolution image in a connecting cable”) are not

Art Unit: 2674

recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to the argument states that “nowhere does Strongin teach or suggest a graphic adaptor is localized to the monitor and graphic adaptor and the monitor comprise a display unit”. However, absent a showing of critically and/or unexpected result, it would been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to relocate the graphic adapter to the monitor side instead of the PC housing side as desired as was judicially recognized with *IN RE JAPIKEE* USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter.

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2674

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DUC Q DINH** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5412**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, Va Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2674
DQD
December 29, 2002



**RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**